



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/857,767	06/11/2001	Phillip S. Wilson	P281421	9618

909 7590 03/03/2003

PILLSBURY WINTHROP, LLP
P.O. BOX 10500
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

OMGBA, ESSAMA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3726

DATE MAILED: 03/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/857,767

Applicant(s)

WILSON, PHILLIP S.

Examiner

Essama Omgba

Art Unit

3726

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 January 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-16 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 13 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 3726

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of the invention of group I, claims 1-13, in Paper No. 6 is acknowledged.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 8-12 are objected to because of the following informalities: "and" in line 6 of claim 8 should read --an--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for apertures formed in the frame or the recesses during the molding process, does not reasonably provide enablement for the apertures being formed after the part is removed from the mold assembly. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. There is no disclosure of the apertures being formed after the part is removed from the mold assembly.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Lan et al. (US patent 6,391,449). Applicant, at page 1 of the specification to be known as AAPA, discloses a method for blow molding large parts that are greater than 2 lbs in weight and having a total surface area of greater than 400 sq. inches, the method comprising using parison reinforced by mineral fillers or glass fibers. AAPA does not disclose the parison being reinforced by particles dispersed within at least one thermoplastic material, the reinforcement particles comprising less than 15% of a total volume of a plastic melt, at least 50% of the reinforcing particles having a thickness of less than 20 nanometers, and at least 99% of the reinforcement particles having a thickness of less than about 30 nanometers. However Lan et al. teaches a plastic melt used in blow molding containers wherein the plastic melt is reinforced with particles having a thickness of less than 20 nanometers, wherein the reinforcement particles representing from about 0.5 to about 20 weight percent of the composite melt, see column 3, lines 1-8, column 4, lines 48-60 and column 6, lines 42-50. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have reinforced the parison of AAPA

Art Unit: 3726

with reinforcement particles as taught by Lan et al., instead of the conventional mineral fillers or glass fibers, in order to provide a cost-effective method of producing articles made from nanocomposite compositions, the articles being suited for use in applications requiring molded parts. Applicant should note that 100% of the reinforcement particles of Lan et al. are less than 30 nanometers. Also with the reinforcement particles representing from about 0.5 to about 20 weight percent of the composite melt, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the reinforcement particles would comprise less than 15% of the total volume of the plastic melt. Applicant should also note that the various blow molding steps recited in the claim are conventional in the art.

7. Claims 2-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA/Lan et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Noba et al. (JP410244889).

With regards to claims 2 and 3, AAPA/Lan et al. discloses a method for blow molding large parts such as radiator supports for automobiles as shown above. Although AAPA/Lan et al. does not specifically disclose the structure of the radiator support structure, however it is known to mold a radiator support structure that includes a radiator frame section with apertures to secure a motor vehicle radiator to the support structure with light receiving recesses with light receiving apertures 11 for securing lights to the support structure, the lights comprising head lights, see abstract and figures 1 and 3-6. Therefore it would have been obvious to provide the radiator support structure of AAPA/Lan et al. with a radiator frame section and light receiving apertures,

Art Unit: 3726

in light of the teachings of Noba et al., in order to efficiently manufacture the radiator support structure and save on cost of manufacture.

For claim 4, Applicant should note that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included recesses constructed to mount parking lights and other elements of a front fascia of an automobile.

For claims 5 and 6, Applicant should note that forming the apertures in the frame or the recesses after the part is removed from the mold assembly is an obvious matter of design choice wherein no stated problem is solved or unexpected results obtained in forming the apertures in the frame or in the recesses after the part is removed from the mold assembly versus forming them during the molding process as disclosed by Noba et al.

For claim 7, Applicant should note that the radiator support structure is conventionally nestingly disposed with respect to a front fascia of a motor vehicle.

8. Claims 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA/Lan et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Petrelli (US patent 5,000,333) and Plant (US patent 5,649,587).

AAPA/Lan et al discloses a method for molding large parts as shown above except for the part being a substantially hollow bumper for a motor vehicle, the interior of the bumper communicating with a fluid consuming component of the motor vehicle wherein the bumper is filled with fluid to serve as a fluid reservoir for the fluid consuming component. However Petrelli teaches a bumper 11 with a washer fluid reservoir 18 in the bumper, see figure 1 for example. Although Petrelli uses a separate reservoir for the

Art Unit: 3726

washer fluid, it is however known to blow mold vehicle hollow components such as radiator fan shrouds which serve as reservoirs for fluids such as coolant fluid or washer fluids, see column 1, lines 5-9, and 30-50 and figures 1 and 5. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have blow molded the part of AAPA/Lan et al as a hollow bumper with fluid reservoirs, in light of the teachings of Petrelli and Plant, in order to save space in the engine compartment and save on manufacturing cost by combining plural parts.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claim 13 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Essama Omgba whose telephone number is (703) 305-2915. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (10-7:30) First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Greg Vidovich can be reached on (703) 308-1513. The fax phone numbers

Art Unit: 3726

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-3579 for regular communications and (703) 305-3580 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

eo
February 23, 2003

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "E. M. J. 29", is located in the middle right section of the page.